

Remarks

Introduction

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 4, 7-9, 18, and 25-26 are pending in the application. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103 to AAPA and Hovey

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over FIGS. 1-5 of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,042,002 to Hovey. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection for at least the following reasons, and Applicant submits that the Office's rejection is improper because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

Independent Claim 18

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 18, page 2, item 2 of the Office Action dated April 17, 2009 alleges that AAPA inherently includes a connector on a printed circuit board 11 and a cable because "the circuit board 11 and the main control circuit 15 must be connected together by some electrical wiring means in order to communicate with each other." However, Applicant asserts that "a connector attached to the secondary printed circuit board" and "a cable for connecting the main printed circuit board to the connector on the secondary printed circuit board," as recited in independent claim 18, are neither literally nor inherently disclosed by AAPA.

Referring to FIG. 3 of AAPA, it appears that the printed circuit board 11 includes printed circuitry upon a top surface thereof which would act as a connector between the monitor 15 and motor part 50. In other words, AAPA does not inherently include a "cable" or "connector" as recited in independent claim 18, for at least the reason that the structural design of AAPA's slide chassis 30 appears to teach away from needing extra cables and connectors.

That is, since AAPA's printed circuit board 11 is mounted directly on support bar 21 which is in direct contact with the motor part 50, there is no apparent need for a connector or a cable between the printed circuit board 11 and the motor part 50. See FIG. 4 and page 2, lines 23-24 of AAPA (i.e., Applicant's Specification). Therefore, neither a connector nor a cable are inherent in AAPA, and accordingly, AAPA does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a connector

Attorney Docket: HATO.2110.0002
Application Serial No. 10/720,350

attached to the secondary printed circuit board” and “a cable for connecting the main printed circuit board to the connector on the secondary printed circuit board,” as recited in independent claim 18.

Referring again to page 2, item 2 of the Office Action dated April 17, 2009, it appears that the Office Action relies on Hovey as allegedly teaching “reinforcing brackets” as recited in independent claim 18. However, Hovey does not remedy the deficiencies of AAPA regarding “a connector attached to the secondary printed circuit board” and “a cable for connecting the main printed circuit board to the connector on the secondary printed circuit board,” as recited in independent claim 18.

In other words, Hovey is directed to a flexible metallic closure which does not include any type of cable, connector, or electronic part whatsoever.

Therefore, since Hovey does not remedy the deficiencies of AAPA, neither AAPA nor Hovey, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations as recited in independent claim 18.

Accordingly, since AAPA and Hovey do not teach or suggest all of the elements set forth in independent claim 18, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully solicited.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103 to AAPA, Hovey and Bigler

Claims 4, 7-9, and 25-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over AAPA in view of Hovey and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,912,541 to Bigler et al. (hereinafter Bigler). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection for at least the following reasons, and Applicant submits that the Office’s rejection is improper because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

Independent Claims 4 and 25

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 4 and 25, page 3, item 3 of the Office Action dated April 17, 2009 references the same rejection above regarding independent claim 18, that AAPA inherently includes a connector on a printed circuit board 11 and a cable because “the circuit board 11 and the main control circuit 15 must be connected together by some electrical wiring means in order to communicate with each other.” However, Applicant asserts that “a connector which is mounted on the secondary printed circuit board, the connector connects the

Attorney Docket: HATO.2110.0002
Application Serial No. 10/720,350

secondary printed circuit board to the main printed circuit board by a cable for controlling a motor of the motor part, and “a cable, having a connector attached to a first end, for connecting a first end of the cable to the connector,” as recited in independent claims 4 and 25, respectively, are neither literally nor inherently disclosed by AAPA.

As stated above regarding independent claim 18, referring to FIG. 3 of AAPA, it appears that the printed circuit board 11 includes printed circuitry upon a top surface thereof which would act as a connector between the monitor 15 and motor part 50. In other words, AAPA does not inherently include a “cable” or “connector” as recited in independent claims 4 and 25, for at least the reason that the structural design of AAPA’s slide chassis 30 appears to teach away from needing extra cables and connectors.

That is, since AAPA’s printed circuit board 11 is mounted directly on support bar 21 which is in direct contact with the motor part 50, there is no apparent need for a connector or a cable between the printed circuit board 11 and the motor part 50. See FIG. 4 and page 2, lines 23-24 of AAPA (i.e., Applicant’s Specification). Therefore, neither a connector nor a cable are inherent in AAPA, and accordingly, AAPA does not teach or suggest, among other things, “a connector which is mounted on the secondary printed circuit board, the connector connects the secondary printed circuit board to the main printed circuit board by a cable for controlling a motor of the motor part, and “a cable, having a connector attached to a first end, for connecting a first end of the cable to the connector,” as recited in independent claims 4 and 25.

Referring again to page 3, item 3 of the Office Action dated April 17, 2009, it appears that the Office Action relies on Bigler as allegedly teaching “a secondary circuit board as recited in independent claims 4 and 25. However, Bigler does not remedy the deficiencies of AAPA and Hovey regarding “a connector which is mounted on the secondary printed circuit board, the connector connects the secondary printed circuit board to the main printed circuit board by a cable for controlling a motor of the motor part, and “a cable, having a connector attached to a first end, for connecting a first end of the cable to the connector,” as recited in independent claims 4 and 25.

Therefore, since Bigler does not remedy the deficiencies of AAPA and Hovey, neither AAPA nor Hovey nor Bigler, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations as recited in independent claims 4 and 25.

Attorney Docket: HATO.2110.0002
Application Serial No. 10/720,350

Accordingly, since AAPA, Hovey and Bigler do not teach or suggest all of the elements set forth in independent claims 4 and 25, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited.

Dependent Claims 7-9 and 26

With respect to claims 7-9 and 26, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reason that claims 7-9 and 26 depend from independent claims 4 and 25, respectively, which are allowable over AAPA, Hovey and Bigler for at least the reasons provided above, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in independent claims 4 and 25, dependent claims 7-9 and 26 are also allowable over AAPA, Hovey and Bigler, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 3, 2009

By: /Charles Y. Park/
Charles Y. Park
Reg. No. 50,709

McNeely Bodendorf, LLP
1156 Fifteenth St., NW
Suite 603
Washington, D.C., USA 20005
Telephone: (202) 429-0020
Facsimile: (202) 478-1813